

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Applicants representative acknowledges the Office's recommendation that certain references listed in the specification be cited in an Information Disclosure Statement if desired to be considered. An IDS is being prepared separately, including some of the references cited in the specification, as appropriate.

The specification has been amended to include Appendix A, which is referenced at page 20, paragraph 74. Appendix A was originally part of the specification because it was included in U.S. Provisional Application 60/459,284, which is incorporated by reference at paragraphs 3 and 5 of the specification.

Claim 16 is provisionally rejected under 36 U.S.C. Section 101 as claiming the same invention as claim 11 of co-pending application 10/893,149. Claim 16 has been cancelled from this application.

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by PCT Publication WO/2001/095249 by Hudson et al. ("Hudson").

Claim 16, 21-22 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication 2001/0037455 to Lawandy et al. ("Lawandy").

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,260,029 to Critelli.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,471 to Chen et al.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Critelli and further in view of Hudson.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawandy in view of Chen.

Claims 1-20 are cancelled without prejudice. These claims are directed to different inventions than claims 21-28, and thus, are being removed from this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in related applications.

Claims 21-28

The rejection of claims 21-28 are based on the Office's contention that the physical characteristics in Lawandy (e.g., at paragraph 33) correspond to the claimed

“jurisdictional information related to the document.” However, Lawandy provides no teaching or even suggestion that the physical characteristics of the document convey jurisdictional information related to the document. The dependent claims include additional elements relating to the functional relationship of the jurisdictional information and the watermark that are even further distinguishable from the cited art.

Therefore, the claims are patentable over the cited art.

Date: November 6, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By /Joel R. Meyer/
Joel R. Meyer
Registration No. 37,677